



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/614,635	07/12/2000	Ulrich Sigmund	RAV10009	2264	
22862 7	7590 11/26/2003		EXAMINER		
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L			WOOD, WILLIAM H		
3475 EDISON MENLO PARI	-	ADDITION DANCE		PAPER NUMBER	
	,		2124	7	
			DATE MAILED: 11/26/2003	3 /	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			PRC		
	Application N .	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/614,635	SIGMUND, ULRICH			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	William H. Wood	2124			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2003 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: ( condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applicant in the same in a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a tion in		
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailib  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Oftimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION.  R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The appropriation of the final and	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•				
2. $\boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:				
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) ⊠ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claim	S.		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: S		idered but does NO	T place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	•				

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments do not overcome the prior art rejection. Applicant asserts Ansari does not disclose the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 12. These have been mapped out in paper 3 mailed 3 April 2003. The broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language reads upon Ansari. Ansari generates an abstract representation and translates for processing. Applicant further asserts Ansari's claim is more limiting than Applicant's invention (page 7, line 11-21; Applicant's remarks received 10 November 2003). This does not alter the fundamental position that Applicant's claimed invention reads upon the disclosure of Ansari. Applicant's broader claim is not a qualification for Applicant to limit Ansari et al. from their rightfully claimed invention. These issues are believed to address Applicant's concerns and as such the indepenent claims along with all other claims are rejected..

TODD INGBERG / PRIMARY EXAMINER